BREINTON PARISH COUNCIL

Extraordinary Meeting at Stretton Sugwas Village hall

Monday 23 October 2023 at 7 00p.m.

Minutes of the Meeting

Present:- Cllr John Hull- Chair (JH), Cllr Emil Morfett (EM), Cllr Tracey Prosser (TP), Cllr Liz Morawiecka (LM) & Cllr Jackie Morris (JM)

23.75 Apologies: Cllr Lorraine Lewis & Lisa Law (Clerk)

In Attendance: 5 members of the public.

23.76 Declarations of interest and written requests for dispensation: all Cllrs confirmed in writing -no declarations of interest.

.

23.77 Planning Applications. To consider comments on current planning applications to be decided by Herefordshire Council and the proposed response from BPC.

23.77.1 P232919/PA4 Little Breinton, Hereford HR4 7PH.

JH -opened the meeting which was to consider this application of change of use from agricultural buildings to 3 smaller dwellings and 2 larger dwellings with associated building operations -comments due by 26th October. He pointed out the changes compared to the previous application (P224335) which was 3 larger and 2 smaller dwellings plus 14 car spaces (now reduced to 12) but the major change is the revised structure. Previous application was refused -basically knocking down the barns meant little was left of the original structure so withdrawn. With this new application more of the original structure has been retained and the drainage report has been revised with subtle changes.

In the proposed response, JH with the help of LM has incorporated previous comments and embodied the earlier letter from the previous application. Also included is the good work EM had produced on the flooding aspects. LM recommended many comments to be made as it is a non pre-determination and pointed out with Class Q prior approval only certain objections are valid such as flood risk and contamination risk. She pointed out that as it is 'change of use' nothing is posted to locals in the vicinity which leaves a very small window to respond.

The following points were raised and discussed before JH read through the proposed response:-

A member of the public was concerned regarding the water sewerage arrangement and the impact on the surrounding area. JH -regarding this flooding issue although there has been little time to address this- after checking -Pigeon Barn and Middle Barn are both classed as high risk of surface water flooding (presumably this does not apply to the stables).

LM - explained that historically when the barns were being developed (used for animals up to then) BPC raised concerns at that time about the increased flood risk from that development which was why future development was limited. Subsequently there has been an issue as a result of more water used due to the development of the barns and Church House expansion.

LM - asked if anyone had taken photos of the flooding last Friday (20th October) or had photos from previous flooding e.g. summer 2021? Members of the public replied that the drainage ditch was full on Friday so worked on it to keep it clean (but not the gully under the road) but had taken no photos. Members were shown some photos of previous flooding which would sent to our clerk and Chair so JH agreed to pass on his email address. LM - said it might be useful if someone could also provide a drawing showing how the flooding occurs. JH -asked if the highway was impassable last Friday? Member of the public replied that no but it was considerably more than a large puddle and would certainly have been impassable if the rain had continued.

LM - although the culverts were a result of that development it is not our responsibility to maintain them. LM asked if there was any run off from the fields opposite shepherds Lane (Bulmers land and pond which is not maintained at all)? Member of the public replied no but pointed out there is no reference to the ditch around the back of the properties which could be frequently jeopardised. If the proposed treatment plant fails for several days, it could mean serious problems with sewage.

Referring to the planning statement 'No listed buildings on site or in the vicinity' but both Pigeon Barn and Middle Barn (grade 2 listed) are within range. EM- the two barns on Lower Hill would also be within range. He also pointed out there were ommissions from H+H drainage report i.e. no reference to a slurry pit.

JH - after reading out the proposed BPC response, the following points were raised and discussed:-

*'**Flooding and pollution risks on the site'*** -any reference to Pigeon Barn development should read Pigeon House Farm Buildings. Where it states ***'...development subject to repeated flooding'*** - development suggests the houses flood but it is the gardens not the houses that flood.

*'**Poor percolation test results...'***LM -the tests which were only based on three test holes, were all undertaken in the summer of 2022 - a period of continuous drought conditions- under estimating the minimum drainage. JH - the point needs to be made that tests undertaken in this way are not an accurate reflection of the seasonal impact. It was mentioned there were errors made in the tests the last time.

'***Source : (link to https://check-long-term-flood etc)*** JH - link was put here instead of the map. LM - proposed a screen grab of the map would be preferable as we should be using current data instead of a link. JH - agreed. Action point (1)

'...proposed development will see that area reduced..' EM- pointed out the overall site area does remain the same.

*'**Where is the former slurry pool located?'*** - LM - instead of asking a question - reference should be made to anything ommitted . EM - the location of the former slurry pool is actually in the first drainage report i.e. at the top behind the barns.

'***We note the Cider Orchard Trust ..'*** JH - as they have been quite pro-active cleaning up Drovers pond (to reduce flooding impact) it might be worth contacting (unless the clerk has already done so) D Marshall at the Cider museum as their restoration work maybe adversly affected by this development. Action point (2)

*'**Why were the EA (Environment Agency) not initially consulted'*** - JH - BPC did ask for EA to be involved so could change this question to 'we are concerned that the EA are not part of this consultation'.

'report recommends a maintenance schedule for the packaged sewage' - there is no legal requirement to set up a maintenance plan. LM -it is skeptical

that this plan would work especially as there is no enforceable agreement regarding maintenance -the question that needs to be addressed is 'where does the legal responsibility lie?' LM - an important point to raise here is that the flood risk/failure to maintain the treatment plant does not pose a risk to the new occupants only significant risk i.e. contamination, to those who live downstream.

'***4) The increased potential for pollution ..... c) ...the National Trust...'*** EM - as Breinton springs is listed as an ancient monument, why has the National Trust not been consulted? LM - agreed - this monument could suffer increased waterlogging of its land and possible erosion as a result of this development so will need to check if Ian Carter has been notified of the application. Action point (3)

JH - with no further points raised, he recommended objections were submitted together with any images, photos and drawings that could show how close the watercourse is to their properties. TP- reminded that two objections can be made from the same household. LM - suggested any objection highlight that there is no bus service. Also requested a copy of any objection be sent to our clerk. Meanwhile she would send all the changes required to JH for the updated response. Action point (4)

The meeting closed at 8.25p.m.